

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
STATESBORO DIVISION**

OLAUDAH McKENZIE,)	
)	
Movant,)	
)	
v.)	CV616-086
)	CR615-001
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

ORDER

Movant Olaudah McKenzie moves to unseal 23 docket entries for use in his 28 U.S.C. § 2255 motion. Doc. 292. He suggests that electronic accessibility to sealed documents in this case would assist him in supporting his legal claims. *Id.* He seeks, *inter alia*, unsealing of warrants and orders granting warrants. *Id.* The Clerk automatically sealed these documents, but there does not appear to be any basis for keeping them under seal and the Government has not opposed his motion.

A review of the requested docket entries shows that none will be of any help to him. Transparency, however, is the norm.¹ Accordingly

¹ As the Eleventh Circuit explains:

The common-law right of access “establish[es] a general presumption that criminal and civil actions should be conducted publicly” and “includes the right to inspect and copy public records and documents.” *Chi. Tribune Co. v.*

Olaudah McKenzie's motion to unseal documents is **GRANTED**. Doc. 292.

SO ORDERED, this 6th day of January, 2017.


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA

Bridgestone/Firestone, Inc., 263 F.3d 1304, 1311 (11th Cir. 2001) (per curiam).
It is “an essential component of our system of justice” and “is instrumental in
securing the integrity of the process.” *Id.*

F.T.C. v. AbbVie Products LLC, 713 F.3d 54, 62 (11th Cir. 2013); *see also United States v. Peterson*, 627 F.Supp.2d 1359, 1373-74 (M.D. Ga. 2008) (granting defendant's motion to unseal search warrant and affidavit because they are “judicial records,” and “judicial documents should not be sealed indefinitely; they should only remained sealed when some interest would be adversely affected if the documents were made public”).